Ty:

This is Wednesday morning.

I take it from your voice mail that you didn't get the packet I faxed you last night @ 388-2914, so here it is @ Mayumi's.

I've a couple more thoughts since last night:

1. Re paying the Byrd bill:

   I want to pay it, for the reasons I gave you (see attached). At the same time, I remember that we agreed at the board meeting that I should hold out 30 days' pay plus the money still owed for vacation time. If we don't guarantee 30 days' more for Liz or Meg, we'd need about $6,000 in salary /taxes/benefits for Ruth and me + about $4,000 in unused vacation for me, Ruth and Meg. [This is confused by not knowing if Ruth is on or off payroll in June].

   So we'd need to hold on to the last $10,000 in order to guarantee those. As you can see, we project finishing this month with $4,300 left. The only way to keep that at $10,000 is not to pay Byrd. But you know my concerns about doing that. Maybe we could pay them at least part of it, just to keep up momentum.

2. Unless we find a modest amount of other money, June will be difficult to manage even if we get all the projected income, because the bulk of that income, from newsstand sales, probably doesn't arrive until the end of the month.

3. I have lots more feelings about JB's draft:

   A. It starts as a letter to subscribers, but evolves into a proposal for the new redesigned and renamed magazine. It may be a good idea, but I don't think we send readers a proposal.

   B. I continue to believe (on intuition, no specific knowledge) that it's a mistake to write the one constituency which has stuck with us and tell them all that's wrong with *WER*.

   But, if we're really announcing the all new and improved "CoEvolution," we would need to tell them why. (By the way, several people in the WELL conference this morning were starting to suggest going back to CQ as a name. Others, meantime, were saying just kill the whole thing. So it goes.

C. I assume most businesses would not make a major change like name/format/etc. change without test-marketing it.

Anyhow, that's this morning's thought. Now, back to last night's . . .

Mike
5/15/96